extends over two or more States or Union Territories in the country.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) It is not considered necessary and feasible to establish one High Court each in every State and Union Territory in the country.

Action taken against companies

28. SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU:
SHRIMATI SATYA BAHIN:
CHOWDHARY RAM SEWAK:

Will the Minister of LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to refer to the answer to Starred Question 339 given in the Rajya Sabha on 23rd March, 1992 and state:

(a) when his Ministry requested the Registrar of Companies to initiate action against each company which had not submitted cost audit reports to his Ministry during the last three years;

(b) what is the present position in each case;

(c) what are the reasons for delay of four years old cases remaining undecided;

(d) what is the nature of offence in each case;

(e) what is the prescribed punishment in each case;

(f) whether it is a fact that in number of cases, the companies have not provided the information as asked by his Ministry on the data submitted by them; and

(g) if so, the names of those companies and action taken against each?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM): (a) and (b) Information is given in the Statement annexed. [*See* Appendix CLXIII, Annexure No. 11] Action againt defaulting companies|cost auditor is in various stages of finalisation.

(c) As legal action against the defaulting companies is involved, the cases are pending at various stages of litigation.

(d) In all cases, the offence relates to non compliance of Saction 233B of the Companies Act, 1956 and or Cost Audit (Report) Rules, 1968.

(e) For contravening the provisions of Section 233B of the Companies Act, 1956, the companies are liable to be punished with fine which may extend to five thousand rupees and every officer of the company who is in default shall be liable to be punished with an imprisonment for a term which may extend to three years or with fine which may extend to five thousand rupees or with both.

(f) and (g) While reviewing the cost audit reports, companies have been asked to submit additional information|clarification as and when required. By and large companies have furnished the requisite information.

Cost audit reports submitted by Companies

29. SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA:
SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU:
SHRIMATI SATYA BAHIN:

Will the Minister of LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to refer to the answer to Starred Question 339 given in Rajya Sabha on 23rd March, at present as claims from the creditors 1992 and state:

(a) what are the details of Cost Audit reports received during 1991-92 which were examined by his Ministry;

(b) what are the details of cases where his Ministry found excessive profits and misutilisation of imports;

(c) what are the names of the companies and products involved by each;

(d) when each finding was sent to the concerned Ministries;

(e) whether his Ministry has receievd any reports from any Ministry about the action taken on their findings; and